UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION

| Eleanor Kathleen Fahlbusch, |) | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| VS. |) | Case No. 3:10cv93 |
| |) | |
| Commissioner of Social Security, |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On December 10, 2009, plaintiff Eleanor Kathleen Fahlbusch commenced this action in the Middle District of Florida by filing a complaint and a motion to proceed informa pauperis. The motion to proceed informa pauperis was denied, with direction from the court to plaintiff to either re-file the motion with the proper supporting financial affidavit establishing indigency, or pay the filing fee, within 20 days. The court advised that failure to comply could result in dismissal of the action. Plaintiff failed to comply, prompting the court to issue an Order to Show Cause why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution. Plaintiff's counsel responded to the Order, requesting a 60 day extension to renew the motion or pay the filing fee. Counsel advised the court that plaintiff had moved to North Dakota and counsel was unable to contact her.

On its own motion, the court in Florida declared venue in the Middle District of Florida improper and entered an order directing plaintiff to show cause why the action should not be transferred to North Dakota. No response was forthcoming and the case was transferred to North Dakota on October 6, 2010. (Doc. #11). A Notice of Direct Assignment and Attorney

Admission letter were mailed to plaintiff's counsel. (Doc. #12). A second notice was sent to

counsel on October 25, 2010. (Doc. #15). In the interim, defendant Commissioner of Social

Security moved to dismiss the action for lack of prosecution under Rule 4(m) of the Federal

Rules of Civil Procedure. (Doc. #13). Plaintiff's counsel has not responded to the court's

Notice of Direct Assignment, has not moved for admission to practice in this court, and has not

filed a response to the motion to dismiss.

Defendant has never been served with the complaint in this action and the time to do so,

120 days from the filing of the complaint, has long since passed. F.R. Civ. P. 4(m). Plaintiff has

never paid the filing fee or been granted permission to proceed informa pauperis. Accordingly,

the action was not properly filed. Plaintiff's whereabouts are unknown and counsel's continued

failure to communicate with the court dictates this action be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. #13) should be **GRANTED**.

Therefore, IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be DISMISSED, without

prejudice.

Notice of Right to Object

Pursuant to Local Rule 72.1 (D)(3), any party may object to this recommendation within

fourteen (14) days after being served with a copy.

Dated this 6th day of December, 2010.

/s/ Karen K. Klein

Karen K. Klein

United States Magistrate Judge

2